

**Getting Welfare Recipients to Work:
Transportation and Welfare Reform**
Summary of Conference Proceedings

Evelyn Blumenberg
Steven Moga
Paul M. Ong

Institute of Transportation Studies
School of Public Policy and Social Research
3250 Public Policy Building
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1656

Working Paper
March 1998

Proceedings of the UCLA Conference on Transportation and Welfare Reform
UCLA Faculty Club
Los Angeles, CA
March 26-27, 1998

UCTC No. 389

The University of California Transportation Center
University of California at Berkeley

Conference sponsored by:
University of California Transportation Center

Co-sponsored by:
Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Los Angeles
New England University Transportation Center, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Los Angeles
Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies, University of California, Los Angeles

FOREWORD

This report is a summary of the proceedings of a conference on transportation and welfare reform held at the University of California, Los Angeles on March 26-27, 1998. The conference was sponsored and hosted by the UCLA Institute of Transportation Studies and cosponsored by the University of California Transportation Center, the New England University Transportation Center at MIT, the UCLA Institute of Industrial Relations, and UCLA's Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies.

Interest in the transportation barriers facing welfare recipients has been sparked by the passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunities Reconciliation Act of 1996 and the creation of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). With its emphasis on reducing the welfare rolls, the new legislation mandates state welfare agencies to establish programs to transition recipients into the labor market or else risk dramatic increases in poverty. Access to transportation -- either automobiles or public transit -- affects welfare recipients' ability to find and retain employment. Yet, very little is known about the relationship between transportation and welfare usage.

The purpose of the conference was to bring together individuals from multiple perspectives, disciplinary backgrounds and institutional settings to:

- examine scholarly research on the relationship between welfare usage and transportation;
- report on successful transportation demonstration projects that serve unemployed and underemployed individuals; and
- establish a network of transit planners, scholars, and human service administrators interested in the relationship between transportation and welfare reform.

It is our hope that the presentations and discussions offered useful insights into the travel behavior of welfare recipients and provided the basis for future research and evaluation on the relationship between transportation and welfare reform.

Evelyn Blumenberg, Assistant Professor

Paul Ong, Professor

Brian Taylor, Assistant Professor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW:	1
Transportation and Welfare Usage: Research, Planning, and Collaboration	
II. SUMMARY OF SESSIONS	6
A. Transportation and Welfare Reform -- Politics and Public Policy	6
B. Welfare-to-Work: The Role of Transportation	8
C. Research on Transportation, Welfare Recipients, and Employment	11
D. Qualitative Evidence of the Travel Behavior of Welfare Recipients	14
E. The Federal Role in Transportation and Welfare Reform	16
F. Transporting the Poor to Work: Current Services and Programs	17
III. AN AGENDA FOR RESEARCH, PLANNING, AND EVALUATION	20
IV. APPENDICES	27
A. For More Information: References	27
B. For More Information: Websites	31
C. Conference Program	32
D. Biographies of Presenters, Moderators, and Discussants	36
E. Participating Organizations	43

TRANSPORTATION AND WELFARE USAGE: RESEARCH, PLANNING, AND COLLABORATION

Evelyn Blumenberg

With the passage of federal and state welfare reform measures, service providers must establish programs to help welfare recipients find jobs. The pertinent issue, therefore, is not **whether** welfare recipients ought to work but rather **how** to enable welfare recipients to make the difficult transition off public assistance and into the labor market. This transition is no small problem. To receive their full block grant allotment, states are required to have 25 percent of their welfare caseload employed in 1997, rising to 50 percent in 2002. According to this schedule, an estimated 832,000 welfare recipients will enter the U.S. labor market between 1997 and 2002.

There are many different approaches to helping recipients find paid employment including programs to provide basic education, child care, job training, job placement, transitional medical care etc. One important component to welfare-to-work programs is transportation services which improve welfare recipients' access to jobs and other employment-related support services.

Although the empirical evidence on the relationship between transportation and welfare usage is sparse, anecdotal evidence is abundant. Most of the major U.S. newspapers have featured articles on transportation as part of their series on welfare reform. (See for example Baily, 1997 and Gross, 1997). The common theme of these articles centers on the arduous commutes of welfare recipients who often live far from employment centers and who have less access than other commuters to transportation that accommodates their work schedules and family responsibilities.

To create programs that meet the transportation needs of welfare recipients, more than anecdotal evidence is necessary. We must answer two key questions:

- Given the myriad of obstacles that welfare recipients face in moving into the labor market, what is the particular relationship between welfare usage and transportation?

- If there is a relationship between welfare usage and access to transportation, what types of programs and services are most effective in meeting the needs of recipients?

With respect to the first question -- the relationship between welfare usage and access to transportation -- there are four important elements to consider: the work commute, job search, job turnover, and child-serving trips.

The Work Commute. When the issue of transportation and welfare reform arises, frequently the discussion centers on whether welfare recipients have access to reliable forms of transportation to take them to and from work. But the work travel of welfare recipients, many of whom live in inner-city neighborhoods, can be long and difficult. The expansion of relatively high-skilled, well paid, central-city employment fails to match the qualifications of many local residents. Moreover, employment growth in the suburban periphery is located far from low-income, central city neighborhoods where many welfare recipients reside. As a result, many welfare recipients are cut off from easy access to employment. To overcome these barriers, recipients must rely on the few remaining central city jobs for which they qualify, move closer to suburban job-rich neighborhoods, or travel relatively long distances to work.

With respect to the last strategy -- long distance travel -- recipients are at a disadvantage relative to other commuters. The dispersed urban structure of metropolitan areas has made reliance on the automobile all but compulsory. Ninety-one percent of all person trips to work are in private vehicles compared to 3 percent on public transit (Federal Highway Administration, date). Yet low-income households have less access to automobiles than other households. Twenty-six percent of low-income households do not have a car compared to 4 percent of other households; and the percentage of low-income, single-parent households without an automobile is even higher -- 36 percent (Murakami and Young, 1997). As a result, low-income commuters are more likely to take public transportation. Five percent of low-income commuters travel to work using public transit compared to only 2 percent of the non-poor (Murakami and Young, 1997). And the commutes of welfare recipients by public transportation are complicated by off-peak travel, reverse commutes from central city to suburbs, and commutes from

I arise on one of the many links. Even long rides on the freeway can be unpredictable; unexpected traffic congestion can lengthen trip times significantly. Therefore, transportation problems can result in recipients' late arrival to work and, ultimately, to being fired. In most cases, the jobs in which welfare recipients work do not require extensive schooling or training. As a result, employers often have little loyalty to their workforce and a low tolerance for problem work behavior.

Finally, for welfare recipients and other low-wage commuters, it is much more difficult to find a backup option if their mode of transportation fails. For most commuters, if their car breaks down, they might rely on a taxi. Or if their bus is late or does not arrive, they might rely on their car. However, low-income commuters may not own an automobile nor may they have the resources to pay exorbitant taxi fares. If a transportation problem arises, they may have to miss a day of work. Once again, frequent absences may lead to lay offs.

Child-serving Trips. It is important to remember that welfare recipients are disproportionately women, particularly low-income, single mothers with children. And the transportation patterns of women are different from those of men largely because they bear disproportionate responsibility for their children. Child-serving trips -- such as trips to the day care center, to the local elementary school, or to both -- are likely to be part of their daily commute. Additionally, working single mothers have to attend to children when emergencies arise in the middle of the day. Therefore, it is important not to limit ourselves to examining welfare recipients' commute to work; we must also think about other trips that are essential to women's employment.

The second major issue that must be addressed is the types of programs and services that will effectively meet the needs of welfare recipients. Thoughtful, empirically-grounded answers to the following questions will enable social service, transportation, and employment agencies to develop effective transportation programs.

- **What** exactly do welfare recipients need access to?
- **When** do welfare recipients need access to these things?
- **Where** specifically do welfare recipients need to go?

Overview

- **How** much transportation access do welfare recipients currently have? (In other words, how easy is it for them to get to where they need to go?)
- **How** can individuals from a diverse array of agencies and organizations collaborate to plan and, provide transportation programs aimed at welfare recipients?
- **How** should we measure the effectiveness of transportation programs aimed at welfare recipients?

The real measure of success will not be the number of transportation programs nor the decline in the percentage of people who are on welfare. True success will be measured by the numbers of former welfare recipients who no longer live in poverty. Success will be achieved through effective policies and programs, including transportation policies, that enable welfare recipients to find and keep jobs that pay enough to adequately support their families.

Summary of Sessions

The conference consisted of five sessions in which various aspects of the relationship between transportation and welfare reform were examined. The conference panels included presentations on current policy and politics, the transportation patterns of welfare recipients, the relationship between transportation access and welfare usage, and examples of best planning practices. Additionally, many of the speakers and discussants offered qualitative descriptions of the travel patterns of welfare recipients; one of these accounts is also included below.

A. Transportation and Welfare Reform: Politics and Public Policy

The opening session of the conference focused on the large picture — the politics and public policy surrounding welfare reform and, more specifically, the nexus between welfare reform and transportation policy. The first speaker, **Michael Wiseman**, Professor of Public Affairs, Urban and Regional Planning, and Economics at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, began the conference with an analysis of the impact of welfare reform thus far. Professor Wiseman explained that welfare caseloads have dropped dramatically in the past two years, citing figures from California, Wisconsin, and other states. He argued, however, that these caseload reductions do not necessarily prove the “success” of welfare reform.

Two considerations must be taken into account in any policy evaluation of welfare reform. First, low unemployment and strong economic growth have dampened the potential negative effects of welfare reform. That is, the condition of the overall economy has made it easier for welfare recipients to find work. Second, welfare reform has not been uniform. States have “reformed” welfare differently. For example, while one state may have introduced benefit caps, redesigned child support provisions, and changed welfare qualifications, other states may have made none of these changes or only some of them. As a result, it is impossible to evaluate on a national level which specific elements of welfare reform “work” and which do not.

Together, these two facts make evaluating federal welfare reform complex. They also indicate that shrinking welfare rolls may not be attributable to the independent effects of welfare reform policy changes.

Finally, Professor Wiseman explained that the implementation of welfare reform is further complicated by uncertainty about the new role of the federal government and management challenges in administering the new system.

Mark Allen Hughes, Vice President for Policy Development of Public/Private Ventures, analyzed welfare reform from a different perspective. He argued that the larger problem faced by policy makers concerned with employing welfare recipients is

Summary of Sessions

the spatial mismatch of residence and employment. Low-income people, such as welfare recipients, often live very far from well-paying jobs for which they are qualified. He outlined three policy approaches to the spatial mismatch problem: (1) creating jobs in the central city, (2) moving low-income people to where the jobs are, often the suburbs, and (3) using transportation to increase the job access of low-income people.

One program designed to address the spatial mismatch problem is the Bridges to Work (BTW) program. Bridges to Work employs the third strategy: using transportation to increase the access of low-income people. Mr. Hughes explained the three components of the program: (1) a metropolitan job placement mechanism, (2) transportation to the job site (a targeted commute), and (3) support services that interact with the commute such as a guaranteed ride home. According to Mr. Hughes, the success of programs like Bridges to Work requires a powerful lead agency.

Key Points:

- While welfare caseloads have declined dramatically since the passage of welfare reform, welfare reform itself may not be the cause of the decrease in the caseload.
- Welfare reform policy implementation faces numerous challenges.
- Transportation programs designed to assist welfare recipients transition to employment must deal with the larger societal problem of the spatial mismatch between the residences of many low-income people and the location of employment.

B. Welfare to Work: The Role of Transportation

Donald Shoup, Professor of Urban Planning at the University of California, Los Angeles, began the second day of the conference by proposing that providing free bus passes to welfare recipients would be an efficient way to increase their access to employment. He stated that welfare recipients can be seen as a group, like students or employees, with specific transportation needs. He continued by presenting examples of how offering free student or employee passes for public transportation is a cost-effective way for universities or employers to provide transportation options.

The University of California, San Diego, for example, offers free student transportation at a cost to the university of only \$5.00 per student per year. Under such a program, many welfare recipients would still drive or get a ride and thus the cost per welfare recipient of the program will be quite low. Programs such as these can serve as examples for transportation policy related to welfare reform. A free bus pass program for welfare recipients would provide a demand-side subsidy and new customers for transit operators. Finally, the program could assist welfare recipients even without adding new transit routes or services; existing fixed route transit services could transport as many as one-third of recipients to their places of employment.

Martin Wachs, Professor of City and Regional Planning and of Civil and Environmental Engineering at the University of California Berkeley, approached the topic of welfare reform and transportation from a different perspective. He argued that transporting welfare recipients to work is part of the larger problem of the lack of transportation options available to low-income people generally.

In devising programs to assist welfare recipients' travel, transportation planners should consider the difficulty low-income people have getting where they need to go using transit. For most low-income parents, getting to work and to day care centers using transit involves long distance trips with multiple transfers resulting in several hours per day devoted to transportation. The lack of adequate transportation for low-income people has long been a problem. Indeed, transportation problems were cited by the McCone Commission's report as one of the root causes of the 1965 Watts Riots.

The lack of adequate transportation services for low-income people, and in particular welfare recipients, is not merely a problem of people in the city having difficulty accessing jobs in the suburbs. While lack of access to suburban jobs is part of the problem, low-income people in rural areas face transportation problems, too. In addition, many low-income people living in the center cities are looking for work in the center cities.

Transit is part of the solution to these problems. Low fares and increased hours of service can improve the access of welfare recipients to employment. But, transit services are often inadequate for people living in rural areas or for people living in the city trying to get to the suburbs. One problem for people in cities is that jobs in the suburbs are dispersed and are often located far from suburban transit stops. In addition, many reverse commute programs have been absorbed by transit providers.

The best means of accessing suburban jobs are cars. On average, the speed of travel is twice as fast using a private automobile than it is using transit. This difference is borne out by the fact that many low-income people use cars. Approximately 75 percent of workers with incomes below \$10,000 have access to cars to travel to work. Cars allow job seekers to apply for night work or jobs with irregular hours; they provide a faster way to get to work, and broaden other choices.

Transporting welfare recipients to work is a complex problem with no one solution. Transit is an important part of the solution, but for many welfare recipients private automobiles offer the best alternative.

Evelyn Blumenberg, Assistant Professor of Urban Planning at the University of California, Los Angeles, analyzed the travel patterns of welfare recipients in California. Using data from the Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) of the 1990 U.S. Census, she found that the travel patterns of welfare recipients are both different from and similar to that of non-welfare recipients.

Close to 20 percent of those on public assistance live in households that do not have a car compared to 4 percent of non-recipients; and as welfare recipients' reliance on welfare increases, they are more likely to live in households without automobiles. Ten percent of recipients commute to work using public transit compared to 7 percent of non-recipients. A higher percentage of welfare recipients leave for work during off-peak hours -- 38 percent compared to 29 percent of non-recipients. And the commute times of recipients are shorter than that for non-recipients.

Although there are differences in the patterns of recipients compared to non-recipients, there are certainly many similarities. The most fundamental similarity is that most

welfare recipients travel to work in cars and leave for work during peak hours. However, the relationship between automobile ownership and welfare usage is a complicated one. According to a Job Readiness Survey conducted by the California Department of Social Services, 35 percent of welfare recipients do not have drivers' licenses. And even among those who travel to work in a car, a large percentage do not own their own cars. Sixty-five percent own their own automobile, 19 percent borrow a car, and 17 percent rideshare or carpool.

Key Points:

- Providing free bus passes to welfare recipients would be an efficient way to increase their access to employment.
- Low fares and increased hours of service can improve the access of welfare recipients to employment.
- Many low-income people use cars currently. Approximately 75 percent of workers with incomes below \$10,000 have access to a car to get to work.
- Transporting welfare recipients to work is a complex problem with no one solution, but for many welfare recipients private automobiles offer the best alternative.
- Travel patterns of welfare recipients are both different from and similar to that of non-recipients.

C. Research on Transportation, Welfare Recipients, and Employment

A number of the conference participants were researchers who have looked at the statistical relationship between various transportation measures and income, welfare usage, residential location, and employment. During the Friday afternoon session four researchers presented their research.

John Quigley, Professor of Economics and Public Policy at the University of California, Berkeley, presented research using the Public Use Microdata sample of the U.S. Census. He examined the relationship between residential location, job creation location, income, and transportation. Professor Quigley's work centers on the question of whether residential location has an independent effect on labor market outcomes. He has found that the spatial isolation of low-income central city residents does have an independent effect; it decreases the likelihood that those residents will be employed.

Professor Quigley also presented a number of other findings from his research. He found, for example, that while low-income households are more centralized than higher income households, job creation has decentralized. In addition, low-income households and central-city households are less likely to own an automobile. Auto ownership, in turn, is positively related to the likelihood of employment.

Many low-income working people, he found, walk to work or get a ride in a private automobile. Those low-income, central-city residents who do use transit are likely to commute to the suburbs and have very long commutes. Finally, low-income people and people receiving public assistance who work are much more likely to commute during non-rush hour periods.

In conclusion, Professor Quigley introduced the notion that the problem of transporting welfare recipients to work is not an infrastructure problem but rather "an imperfection in capital markets," specifically the market for used cars. He encouraged policy makers to explore ways to subsidize the purchase of used cars by former welfare recipients.

Summary of Sessions

Michael Rich, Associate Professor of Political Science at Emory University, presented his research on employment and transportation in the Atlanta metropolitan area, the eleventh largest metropolitan area in the United States. Approximately 30,000 people in the metropolitan area receive Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF).

Rich analyzed the available jobs for which low-skill workers might be qualified, plotted the geographic location of those jobs, and then compared the location of those jobs to the locations served by public transit. The type and location of available jobs were gathered through an examination of employment listings in the *Atlanta Journal Constitution* in January 1997.

The study revealed that three out of four available jobs were located in the suburbs. In addition, less than half of all jobs were located within a quarter-mile of public transportation (Rich, 1997). In total, Rich found that fewer than three out of every 100 jobs in the study were entry level, paid \$15,000 per year or more, and were accessible by public transportation (Rich, 1997).

Paul Ong, Professor of Urban Planning at the University of California, Los Angeles, presented findings from his research on employment and automobile ownership among welfare recipients. Professor Ong analyzed data from a survey of more than 1,000 female heads of household receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children that was conducted by the California Department of Social Services.

Ong found statistically significant differences between welfare recipients with and without access to an automobile. Welfare recipients who owned an automobile were more likely to have worked in the past month and those who were employed worked more hours. They also had higher mean monthly earnings.

Ong concluded that owning an automobile is instrumental to employment and welfare reform should facilitate auto ownership.

Julia Henly, Professor of Social Welfare at the University of Chicago, discussed one of the often-cited solutions to the spatial mismatch program, residential relocation, and its impacts on social networks. Her research asked the question: Do residential relocation programs lead to the break up of social networks or the creation of new networks?

Henly found that residential relocation programs, while they may benefit families in some ways, may also lead to more difficulty in finding child care. The support networks that low-income people count on are localized and fragile. A study of the

Summary of Sessions

Moving to Opportunity Program, for example, showed that relocation meant that participants were more likely to know someone who was employed but less likely to find out about childcare. Henly argued that residential relocation programs could be improved if they included a support network strategy.

Key Points:

- Many low-income working people walk to work or get a ride in a car; they also may commute during non-rush hour periods. Those who do use public transit are likely to have long commutes to the suburbs.
- Fewer than three out of every 100 jobs in a recent study were entry level, paid \$15,000 per year or more, and were accessible by public transportation.
- A recent study found that welfare recipients who owned an automobile were more likely to have worked in the past month and those who worked more hours. They also had higher mean monthly earnings.
- Residential relocation programs, such as the Moving to Opportunity program, while they may benefit families in some ways, may also lead to more difficulty in finding child care. The support networks that low-income people count on are localized and fragile.

D. Qualitative Evidence of the Travel Behavior of Welfare Recipients

An unexpected theme that emerged from the conference was the importance of the stories of individual welfare recipients' transportation challenges. A number of the presenters stated that while quantitative research and statistical analyses were key tools for policy making, listening to low-income women's experiences is also important. One detailed example was provided by **Debbie Niemeier**, Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering at the University of California, Davis.

Niemeier talked to case managers in Sacramento and randomly selected welfare recipients with whom to travel. She traveled with between 10 and 12 women. One of these women was Mary, whose experience is in many ways typical of the challenges women with children face daily trying to get off welfare.

Mary receives TANF (formerly known as AFDC) and she is 20 years old. She has two kids, ages four years and eight months respectively. Mary is a welfare-to-work program participant. She lives in a 400 square foot one-bedroom apartment in West Sacramento and the apartment is relatively safe and costs \$395 per month. She needed subsidized housing but discovered that there was a ten-year wait for the program.

On the day that Professor Niemeier met Mary to travel with her, Mary was waiting for her husband to come care for the younger child who had pink eye. The child was not allowed at childcare so the husband's help was needed. To complicate matters, the husband had a history of being unreliable. Fortunately, the childcare center was approximately 1,000 feet away from her home.

The day of traveling together began when Mary dropped off the four-year-old at the child care center; her child care costs are paid for by the welfare program. Her bus pass costs \$45/month and is also paid for by the program. The childcare center has strict rules; if parents are 30 minutes late in picking up their children, the staff calls child protective services. The center is open from 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. and cannot accommodate parents who work evening and weekend shifts.

Summary of Sessions

Mary attends school to become a dental billing specialist. Together Mary and Professor Niemeier waited for the bus, which arrived at 9:30 a.m. While they were waiting, Mary explained that she has a high school education and gets no child support. The children each have different fathers and her family lives 50 miles away.

Mary takes the bus to the light rail station each day. When she first started her routine, she requested bus and rail schedules. Only some of the information she needed arrived by mail. Also, many of the materials were written in ways that made it difficult for Mary to understand.

“What would make it easier?” Professor Niemeier asked. “A car,” Mary replied without hesitation.

The light rail trip takes one hour and 35 minutes, a trip that would have taken 30 minutes by auto.

Professor Niemeier pointed out that there is not much buffering in Mary’s schedule. The welfare program requires that Mary work an additional 15 hours per week. Given her schedule, the only time she has available to work is between 7:30 and 10:30 a.m. The only job that she can manage, therefore, is a job at a local McDonalds where she earns \$4.15 an hour.

Professor Niemeier concluded that transportation changes must be part of an integrated strategy that includes child support and education.

Key points:

- The best policy that transportation planners could pursue would be to help welfare recipients gain access to automobiles.
- Other common problems faced by women on welfare are lack of education and lack of support and/or abuse from male partners.

E. The Federal Role in Transportation and Welfare Reform

Gloria Jeff, from the United States Department of Transportation, spoke about the federal role in transportation and welfare reform. She began by stating that her talk was explicitly from a transportation perspective and that the future of transportation policy must be international and inter-modal. In the area of welfare reform, she explained, transportation can be one part of the solution but is only a part.

Transportation difficulties among low-income people seeking work are not unique to cities. The spatial mismatch problem is also a rural problem. One of the problems with public transportation is that many low-income parents have complex trip-making activities. Policy makers must take into consideration the importance of day care, parent involvement in schools, and women's sense of personal security. Policy makers also need to remember that not all job seekers are unskilled.

The solution depends on partnerships between local government agencies, the business community, community-based organizations, and nonprofit organizations. The federal government has promoted these partnerships. The role of the federal government is leadership, which includes funding, training, evaluation and research, and efforts to employ former welfare recipients in the field of transportation.

Paul Leonard, from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), addressed the spatial mismatch problem. He began by explaining that the challenge of moving welfare recipients into employment is multi-agency responsibility, noting that transportation is a part of a long-term community development strategy. He continued by explaining the Bridges to Work (BTW) program.

Leonard explained that BTW is an experimental program designed to test the ability of a program to link low-income residents to jobs. The program is in five different cities around the country and includes more than a thousand participants. The BTW program has four key features: collaboration, flexible transportation linkage, a focus on employers and job placement, and supportive services.

Summary of Sessions

It is important to note that two major changes have occurred since BTW began which could affect the outcome of the study: the economy improved significantly and welfare reform was enacted. Early findings from the program have shown that planning and implementation are more difficult and time-consuming than expected. HUD has also found that no one type of agency is more suited to be the lead agency for the program than other types of agencies. Finally, Leonard noted that recruiting participants was more difficult than expected, that early direct outreach to employers is important, and that flexibility in the use of funds is needed.

Key points:

- The federal government has promoted partnerships between local government agencies, the business community, community-based organizations, and non-profit organizations to address the issue of welfare reform and transportation.
- Transportation-related jobs can be a source of employment for welfare recipients looking for work.
- Bridges to Work is a nationwide demonstration program designed to link low-income people and jobs. The program has been more difficult to implement than expected.

F. Transporting the Poor to Work: Current Services and Programs

Ginger Gherardi, Executive Director of the Ventura County Transportation Commission, explained that Oxnard, California has a pilot project of one stop “Job to Career Centers.” The centers aim to serve the whole family, rather than offer specialized services. More than 50 percent of the “clients” of these centers do not have automobiles. Providing information about transportation options is a major service provided by the centers.

Ventura County has identified five key services it can provide in this area: (1) provide options, (2) list information on the Internet, (3) distribute a smart card, (4) offer on-site ride share information, and (5) improve public transit. However, spending more money on transit may not be the solution. Transit improvements are expensive, take many years to implement, and cannot serve the entire Ventura County area effectively. Thus Ventura County has begun a pilot program which assists low-income people in the purchase of automobiles. Qualified CalWORKs recipients can purchase reconditioned used vehicles at a low cost from the county.

Before helping welfare recipients get cars, however, the program seeks to maximize use of other services. For instance, the guaranteed ride home program offers a ride home in a taxi if a transit user has missed the last bus and is less than 25 miles away and a rental car if greater than 25 miles away.

The County is also pursuing a new idea: The Smart Car Sharing Concept. County-owned cars would be assigned to qualified persons in need of transportation during certain times of the day. The car could be checked out for a few hours and then delivered to another location to be used by another person. The program is still under development.

Genevieve Giuliano, Professor and Acting Dean in the School of Urban Planning and Development at the University of Southern California, presented research on the mobility of low-income households and described a study she recently conducted on informal transportation.

According to Professor Giuliano's research, the mode of transportation used to get from place to place varies by household income. For instance, the lowest income individuals commonly use walking as means of transportation. She also found that the frequency of travel and miles traveled are both related to income. Less income leads to fewer discretionary trips, decreased access to a private vehicle, and fewer adults in the household with drivers' licenses.

Professor Giuliano explained that public transit serves very specialized markets. She identified three specialized markets: individuals who live in households without private vehicles, those who live in older eastern cities with extensive rail service, and central city commuters. Transit is limited to specialized markets because of its travel time disadvantage; it is much faster to get from place to place using a private automobile.

Informal transportation (also called neighborhood carpools) is an important way for low-income people to get where they need to go. Neighborhood carpools are rides given in private automobiles by the owner to a neighbor or acquaintance for a small fee. In a study of neighborhood carpools in Los Angeles, Professor Giuliano found

Summary of Sessions

that the drivers of the cars are usually female and that driving their neighbors where they need to go is a source of income for them. The passengers are mostly female, have no access to a private vehicle, and are very low income. The drivers are motivated by earning extra money and by helping others. The passengers use neighborhood carpools because they offer decreased travel time, increased personal safety, increased convenience, and a low price. The price is universally \$1.00 per trip

Transit has many disadvantages for welfare recipients including long travel times, inconvenient service, the possibility of crime, and high fares. Neighborhood carpools, in contrast, offer door-to-door service, a minimum of wasted time, safety, and a low cash fare.

Key points:

- Ventura County has begun a pilot program which assists low-income people in the purchase of an automobile. Qualified CalWORKs recipients can purchase reconditioned used vehicles at a low cost from the county.
- Public transit has many disadvantages for welfare recipients, including longer travel time, more scheduling work, the possibility of crime, and high fares. The neighborhood carpool service, in contrast, offers door-to-door service, a minimum of wasted time, safety, and a low cash fare.

AN AGENDA FOR RESEARCH, PLANNING AND EVALUATION

Paul M. Ong

The Challenge: Over the next few years, we face a daunting challenge of finding effective transportation solutions to help nearly a million welfare recipients secure meaningful employment. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 has revolutionized this nation's social policy by transforming welfare from an income-maintenance program to a transition-to-work program, and in doing so, has changed the way that disparate institutions and agencies should operate. The effectiveness of welfare reform depends on how well social, health, employment and transportation organizations negotiate uncharted territories to redefine their practices and operations in ways that were unthinkable just a few years ago.

Improving access to transportation is a necessary, albeit not sufficient, element of welfare reform. While transportation is not the single most important barrier facing welfare recipients, analysts and recipients have identified transportation problems as being somewhere between the third and the fifth most pressing impediment to the employment of recipients. Unfortunately, partnerships between agencies and researchers to address the transportation barriers facing welfare recipients have been scarce. Many promising approaches are relatively new and, therefore, untested. Moreover, given the scope of recent changes to the welfare system, it is unclear whether current, small-scale efforts can effectively transport the thousands of recipients who will need to find employment. Therefore, we must learn from the past but be willing to chart a new agenda.

The immediate tasks facing us include:

- developing analytical tools to understand the complexity and the diversity of the transportation problems facing welfare recipients;
- designing strategies that utilize multiple approaches and resources; and
- evaluating and providing feedback on the effectiveness of these strategies and programs.

What makes these challenges more daunting is the tight schedule for welfare reform. Current recipients face a two-year time limit for their present welfare spell (and later a five-year lifetime limit on total time on welfare). This compressed time frame forces us to move quickly up the learning curve. The process demands rapid diffusion of new knowledge and practices through an unprecedented collaboration among private and public institutions. At the same time, we should not lose sight of the larger issue in which this one is embedded -- the more universal transportation needs of the transit dependent and the working poor.

Needs Assessment: First, we must use needs assessments to identify the tremendous diversity of the recipient population, their communities, and the transportation barriers that they face.

As a group, welfare recipients have less education, fewer skills and more limited work experience than the non-recipient population; nonetheless, there is considerable variation among TANF adults. At one extreme are those recipients who do not have a high school degree and have little or no prior employment history; at the other extreme are those who have a college education and extensive work experience. These two sub-groups, and those groups that lie somewhere along the continuum, have disparate service needs and job prospects. Recipients also differ in terms of family structure. Some have one or more infants in the home; others have older, school-aged children. Those in the former group must find child care while those in the latter group may need after school care. These variations in job readiness and family composition translate into variations in recipients' transportation needs.

Geographic locations (counties, cities, and neighborhoods) differ in the residential location of recipients relative to the locations of job opportunities, child care, and other employment-related support services. The geography of rural areas is unlike that of their urban counterparts. But even among and within urbanized areas, there are noticeable variations. Many TANF adults encounter "spatial mismatch" – the geographic separation of the inner-city poor from the job-rich suburbs – but this is not a universal phenomenon. Some TANF adults reside in job-rich (and service-rich) areas; consequently, their transportation needs differ from those facing a "spatial mismatch."

The ability to exist welfare depends greatly on access to transportation. A fortunate minority have access to an automobile, but the majority are transit dependent. Needs assessments must identify the availability, frequency, quality, and reliability of transportation services; they must also identify the percentage of recipients who are within a reasonable walking distance to a transit stop. Additionally, it is critical to determine if the routes take them to the right places at the right times. Transportation

needs are not simply defined by linking recipients to work, but also by the complex trip chaining that involves family obligations (such as trips to the day care center, schools, the laundromat, grocery stores), job search, and employment.

By utilizing spatially-based data, GIS (geographic information systems) software can be used to map and measure recipients' access to transportation. The available data should include information on welfare recipients, potential employers, child care and other employment-related services, and transportation networks. Administrative data are needed because traditional census and transportation data are outdated and not sufficiently detailed. These data must be used with care to protect the confidentiality of the records and the privacy of individuals and businesses. To the degree possible, data should be linked at the individual level; e.g., a recipient with her childcare provider and employer. This enables us to observe travel patterns directly rather than make inferences. Analytical GIS tools can be used to identify any transportation gaps. Because administrative records have limitations, it is crucial to conduct surveys to collect detailed and complementary information on such issues as the recipients' perception of their transportation needs and their knowledge of transit systems and other transportation services.

Program Planning and Implementation: Given the heterogeneity of needs among welfare recipients, one solution cannot fit all. An effective transportation plan must incorporate a mix of approaches. We can facilitate the development of a plan through a sharing of ideas and experiences across regions and service areas to identify "best practices." To minimize unwanted duplication of services and to maximize the returns to investments, it is important that transportation agencies coordinate their efforts with welfare departments and community-based organizations.

Although the majority of welfare recipients are transit dependent, a comprehensive transportation plan should also address the needs of car owners. Policymakers should adopt programs that make it easier for recipients to operate and maintain a reliable car, including training for do-it-yourself maintenance, referrals to reliable and honest automobile repair services, and access to reasonable auto insurance. Temporary assistance should be provided to recipients encountering unforeseen disruptions to employment or major automobile repairs. Improving the continuity of employment and automobile ownership can prevent short-term crises from transforming into prolonged joblessness.

Financing these plans will not be easy or cheap. Funding opportunities are highly fragmented. Federal and state agencies have their own sources of funds; philanthropic and corporate foundations have their own guidelines. Because resources are limited, organizations and agencies must tap as many different sources

An Agenda

as possible. In addition to public agencies and foundations, some community and religious institutions have expressed desires to assist welfare recipients find work. Some of these organizations have vans and buses that can be operated at marginal cost.

Additional services can be generated through a more efficient use of existing resources. Because some neighborhoods face a potentially significant increase in transit ridership, public transportation agencies should consider changes in routes and schedules to accommodate this growth. Another option is to restructure regressive transit subsidies and fares. In some metropolitan areas, regional transportation planners have developed services to lure higher income out of their cars at the expense of their predominantly low-income transit riders. Moreover, flat fares, which charge patrons regardless of distance, hurt low-income riders who take shorter trips than higher-income patrons.

Plans must include the private sector. Employers, individually or in consortiums, can support van pools and ride sharing to enhance travel to job-rich, suburban destinations. These services should be coupled with a guaranteed ride-home for those rare occasions when there is a family emergency or when an individual must work over time. An effective plan must also incorporate market-based solutions, such as taxis, private shuttles, and informal transportation systems, when they are appropriate and cost effective. Private sector options can also include programs to encourage some recipients to form businesses to provide rides. Realizing the full potential of the market may require revising laws and regulations that are unreasonably prohibitive of private entrepreneurship, but this should be done carefully to ensure public safety.

Monitoring and Evaluation: In the rush to implement transportation programs aimed at welfare recipients, there will be new and untried approaches as well as an expansion of existing approaches. One major task is to discover what works, what needs to be modified, and what should be abandoned. Timely and reliable feedback is key to a system of continuous policy and program improvements. This requires monitoring program outcomes which can be implemented using the geographic information system discussed earlier. The data base should include information on the travel patterns of welfare recipients including their mode, origin and destination, time of travel, and trip purpose. In addition to administrative data, information should be collected through a post-welfare survey. This information can be used to determine whether employment is related to programs that enhance recipients' access to transportation.

One major difficulty in determining program effectiveness is the lack of experimental-control design in establishing transportation services. Ideally, one wants to randomly assign recipients to either a group receiving specific service or to a control group that does not receive this service. If there is a statistical difference in outcome (e.g., employment rate), then the results can be attributed to participation in the experimental program. Under such a research design, it is possible to estimate the economic benefit of providing the service by comparing the monetary benefits of the improvement with the cost of providing the service. Moreover, it is possible to identify the most efficient programs by ranking their benefit-cost ratios. Unfortunately, there is no known effort to use the experimental-control approach to designing transportation programs for welfare-to-work recipients.

Without randomization, it is difficult to estimate the independent contribution of a transportation program because the outcome can be contaminated by self selection and "creaming." The self-selection effect occurs when the more motivated and capable recipients are more likely to seek services so they can improve their chances of finding employment, and the creaming effect occurs when agencies select these types of individuals to ensure positive program results. When either or both occur, it is difficult to separate the program's impact from the influence of the selectivity of the participants.

Despite the lack of an experimental approach, program evaluations can use statistical methods that minimize selection bias. These evaluations rely on analyzing natural variations. No program will be universal; there will continue to be dramatic differences in recipients' access to transportation. Therefore, we need to know how these variations affect the odds of a successful transition to work.

Broader Policy Concerns: The effort to improve access to transportation for

welfare recipients raises some fundamental policy questions regarding transit usage, horizontal inequality, and institutional structure. These issues are politically charged.

Some environmental analysts and advocates have objected to including automobile ownership as a component of welfare-to-work programs. They argue that this would add to air pollution and increase energy use. What makes this position problematic are issues of fairness and effectiveness. Research shows that car ownership promotes employment. This is not surprising since welfare recipients are embedded in an economy predicated on having access to an automobile. While welfare reform should not create a new entitlement in the form of owning a car, neither should it create a class of individuals who are permanently dependent on public transportation. In other words, welfare recipients should not be forced to bear a disproportionate share of the cost of reducing pollution and energy use; instead, they should be afforded reasonable opportunities for owning and operating a car and given reasonable incentives to use public transit, the same types of incentives available to non-recipients. The broader goal of welfare reform should be to fully integrate welfare recipients into our society -- giving welfare recipients the same rights and responsibilities as non-recipients including responsibility for protecting our environment.

One undesirable consequence of creating transportation programs specifically to support welfare-to-work is creating horizontal inequality. Horizontal inequality exists when two individuals within the same economic class are treated differently. With welfare reform, we create differences between two subgroups among the poor, welfare recipients and the working poor. Although it is important to help transition recipients into the labor market, it is unwise to give welfare recipients long-term benefits, unless those benefits are also available to the working poor. One dangerous consequence of welfare reform is a shifting of resources away from the working poor. This can occur, for example, when funds are reallocated from one transit route to another or from one program to another. But even without a reallocation of funds, serving recipients can generate other negative externalities. For example, the influx of recipients into the labor market can cause existing bus service to become increasingly overcrowded leading to a poorer quality of transit service for everyone. While some degree of horizontal inequality is unavoidable, it should be minimized by universal policies that help improve the transportation options and services for the working poor.

Initial efforts to promote collaboration between welfare and transportation agencies have produced mixed results. In some but certainly not all regions, cooperation has been high around the task of "needs assessment." However, there is a real danger that inter-agency competition and conflict will emerge when agencies ultimately address the allocation of resources to new and existing programs. While social policy

in the U.S. has been fundamentally transformed, the array of organizations charged with implementing these new policies remains unchanged. Under these circumstances, assembling a comprehensive and efficient transportation system that meets the needs of welfare recipients and the working poor is far from certain. Instead, what exists is a highly fragmented organizational structure that includes many agencies and organizations in which welfare-to-work efforts are secondary to their primary, non-welfare mission. Some aspects of devolution are desirable because they provide flexibility and autonomy that enable communities to meet local concerns, but extreme decentralization can hinder the development of a rational delivery system. Essential to effective policymaking is both collaboration and leadership. There must be collaboration to help develop and set overall priorities and the leadership to implement these priorities and to ensure that they result in efficient and effective transportation options for the working poor.

APPENDIX A. REFERENCES

Bailey, Eric (1997). "From Welfare Lines to Commuting Crush; Many Reentering Work Force Live Far from Jobs. Experts Fear Transit Woes May Slow Reform," *Los Angeles Times*, Monday, October 6.

Blumenberg, Evelyn and Paul Ong (forthcoming). "Job Accessibility and Welfare Usage: Evidence from Los Angeles," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, Fall, 1998.

Coulton, Claudia, Laura Leete, and Neil Bania (1997). *Housing, Transportation and Access to Suburban Jobs by Welfare Recipients in the Cleveland Area*. Cleveland, OH, Center for Urban Poverty and Social Change, Case Western Reserve University.

Ellwood, David T. (1986). "The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis: Are Teenage Jobs Missing in the Ghetto?" in R. Freeman and H. Holzer (eds). *The Black Youth Unemployment Problem*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fitzgerald, John M. (1995). "Local Labor Markets and Local Area Effects on Welfare Duration," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, v. 14, No. 1, pp. 43-67.

Gross, Jane (1997). "Poor Without Cars Find Trek to Work is Now a Job," *The New York Times*, Tuesday, November 18.

Holzer, Harry J. (1991). "The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis: What has the Evidence Shown?" *Urban Studies*, v. 28, pp. 105-122.

Hughes, Mark Alan (1991). "Employment Decentralization and Accessibility. A Strategy for Stimulating Regional Mobility," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, v.57:3, pp. 288-298.

Hughes, Mark Alan (1993). "Antipoverty Strategy Where the Rubber Meets the Road: Transporting Workers to Jobs," *Housing Markets and Residential Mobility*, eds. G. Thomas Kinglsey and Margery Austin Turner. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.

Hughes, Mark Alan (1995). "A Mobility Strategy for Improving Opportunity," *Housing Policy Debate*, v.6:1, pp. 271-297.

Ihlanfeldt, K. (1994). "The Spatial Mismatch between Jobs and Residential Locations within Urban Areas," *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, v. 1:1, pp. 219-244.

Ihlanfeldt, K., and Sjoquist, D. (1989). "The Impact of Decentralization on the Economic Welfare of Central City Blacks," *Journal of Urban Economics*, v. 16, pp. 110-30.

Ihlanfeldt, K., and Sjoquist, D. (1990). "Job Accessibility and Differences in Youth Employment Rates," *American Economic Review*, v.80, pp. 267-76.

Kain, John F. (1992). "The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis: Three Decades Later." *Housing Policy Debate*, v.3:2, pp. 371-460.

Lacombe, Annalynn (1998). *Welfare Reform and Access to Jobs in Boston*. Bureau of Transportation Statistics, U.S. Department of Transportation, BTS98-A-02, January.

Lacombe, Annalynn and William Lyons (1998). "The Transportation System's Role in Moving Welfare Recipients to Jobs," *Volpe Transportation Journal*. Spring, Number 2.

Murakami, Elaine and Jennifer Young (1997). "Daily Travel by Persons with Low Income," paper for the NPTS Symposium, Maryland, October 29-31.

Ong, Paul (1996) Work and Car Ownership Among Welfare Recipients, *Social Work Research*, 20(4), pp. 255-262.

Ong, Paul and Evelyn Blumenberg (1997). "Job Access, Commute and Travel Burden Among Welfare Recipients," *Urban Studies* 35(1), pp. 77-93.

O'Regan, Katherine and John M. Quigley (1998). "Cars for the Poor," *Access*. Spring, Number 12.

Osterman, Paul (1991), "Welfare Participation in a Full Employment Economy: The Impact of Neighborhood," *Social Problems* 38(4), pp. 475-491.

For More Information

Presser, Harriet B. and Amy G. Cox (1997). "The Work Schedules of Low-Educated American Women and Welfare Reform," *Monthly Labor Review*, v. 120:4, April.

Pugh, Margaret (1998). "Barriers to Work: The Spatial Divide between Jobs and Welfare Recipients in Metropolitan Areas," discussion paper, The Brookings Institution, Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, September.

Rich, Michael (1997). "The Reality of Welfare Reform: Employment Prospects in Metropolitan Atlanta," *Georgia Academy Journal*. Summer.

Rosenbaum, James E. (1995), "Changing the Geography of Opportunity by Expanding Residential Choice: Lessons from the Gautreaux Program," *Housing Policy Debate* 6(1), pp. 231-269.

Rosenbaum, James E. and Susan J. Popkin (1991), "Employment and Earnings of Low-Income Blacks Who Move to Middle-Class Suburbs," in Christopher Jencks and Paul E. Peterson (eds.), *The Urban Underclass* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution).

Shen, Q. (1998). "Location Characteristics of Inner-City Neighborhoods and Employment Accessibility of Low-Wage Workers," *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, v. 25, pp. 345-365.

Simpson, Wayne (1992), *Urban Structure and the Labour Market. Worker Mobility, Commuting, and Underemployment in Cities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Taylor, Brian and Paul Ong (1995). "Spatial Mismatch or Automobile Mismatch? An Examination of Race, Residence, and Commuting in U.S. Metropolitan Areas," *Urban Studies*, v.32:9, pp. 1453-1474.

U.S. Bureau of Transportation Statistics (1998). *Welfare Reform and Access to Jobs in Boston*. BTS98-A-02, January.

U.S. General Accounting Office (1998). *Welfare Reform. Transportation's Role in Moving From Welfare to Work*. GAO/RCED-98-161.

Vartanian, Thomas (1995), "Locational Effects on AFDC Spells: Examining Local Labor Markets and the Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis," unpublished manuscript. Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research, Bryn Mawr College.

APPENDIX B. WEBSITES

Organization/Agency	Address
Brookings Institution	www.brookings.org
Charity Cars International	www.charitycars.org
Community Transportation Association of America	www.ctaa.org/welfare
HandsNet	www.handsnet.org/handsnet2/welfare.reform/
Manpower Demonstration Research Corp.	www.mdrc.org
National Conference of State Legislatures	www.ncsl.org/statefed/welfare/welfare.htm
National Governor's Association Center for Best Practices	www.nga.org/CBP/Activities/WelfareReform.asp
Public/Private Ventures	tap.epn.org/ppv/ppbrid.html
U.S. Federal Transit Administration	http://www.fta.dot.gov/wtw/index.html
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/news/welfare/index.htm
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development	http://www.hud.gov/wlrefrm.html
U.S. Department of Labor	http://wtw.doleta.gov/default.htm
The Urban Institute	http://www.urban.org/hotopics.htm#welfare
Welfare Information Network	http://www.welfareinfo.org
Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network	http://www.calib.com/peerta

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Thursday Evening, March 26

5:00-6:00 p.m. Opening Reception
Registration

6:00-7:30 p.m. Dinner

7:30-8:00 p.m. Welcome and Conference Overview

Transportation and Welfare Usage: Research, Planning, and Collaboration

- *Evelyn Blumenberg*, Visiting Assistant Professor of Urban Planning, University of California, Los Angeles

8:00 -- 9:30 p.m. **Session I: Transportation and Welfare Reform -- Politics and Public Policy**

Moderator:

- *Barbara Nelson*, Dean, School of Public Policy and Social Research, UCLA

Presenters:

- *Michael Wiseman*, Professor of Public Affairs, Urban and Regional Planning, and Economics, University of Wisconsin and Senior Fellow, the Urban Institute
- *Mark Alan Hughes*, Vice President for Policy Development, Public/Private Ventures

Friday morning, March 27

8:00-9:00 a.m. BREAKFAST

9:00-10:00 a.m. **Session II: Welfare-to-Work: The Role of Transportation**

Moderator:

- *Donald Shoup*, Professor of Urban Planning, University of California, Los Angeles

Presenters:

- *Martin Wachs*, Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering and City and Regional Planning and Director of the University of California Transportation Center, University of California, Berkeley
- *Evelyn Blumenberg*, Visiting Assistant Professor of Urban Planning, University of California, Los Angeles

10:00-10:15 a.m. BREAK

10:15-12:00 p.m. **Session III: Transportation, Welfare Recipients, and Employment**

Moderator:

- *Debbie Niemeier*, Assistant Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California, Davis

Presenters:

- *John Quigley*, Professor of Economics and Public Policy, University of California, Berkeley
- *Michael Rich*, Associate Professor of Political Science, Emory University
- *Paul Ong*, Professor of Urban Planning and Social Welfare, University of California, Los Angeles

Discussant:

- *Julia Henly*, Assistant Professor of Social Welfare, University of Chicago (discussant)

Friday afternoon, March 27

12:00-1:00 p.m. LUNCH

1:00-1:30 p.m. **Session IV: A Federal Perspective**

Moderator:

- *Brian Taylor*, Professor of Urban Planning, University of California, Los Angeles

Speaker:

- *Gloria Jeff*, Deputy Administrator, Federal Highway Administration

1:30-3:15 p.m. **Session V: Transporting the Poor to Work: Current**

Services and Programs

Moderator:

- *Rosina Becerra*, Professor of Policy Studies and Social Welfare and Director of the Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Los Angeles

Speakers:

- *Genevieve Giuliano*, Professor of Urban Planning and Development and Director, Lusk Center Research Institute, University of Southern California
- *Ginger Gherardi*, Executive Director, Ventura County Transportation Commission
- *Paul Leonard*, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research, Department of Housing and Urban Development

3:15-3:30 p.m.

BREAK

3:30- 5:00 p.m.

Session VI: Future Research and Policy Directions

Moderator:

- *Paul Ong*, Professor of Urban Planning and Social Welfare, University of California, Los Angeles

Speakers:

- *Joe Coughlin*, Director, New England University Transportation Center, Center for Transportation Studies
- *Werner Schink*, Chief, Research Branch, California Department of Social Services
- *Raul Ramirez*, California Greater Avenues for Independence Program

BIOGRAPHIES OF PRESENTERS, DISCUSSANTS, AND MODERATORS

Rosina Becerra is Professor of Policy Studies and Social Welfare in the School of Public Policy and Social Research at the University of California, Los Angeles. Her research focuses on policy issues in health and mental health over the life span, with particular emphasis in social gerontology and child welfare. She is the principal investigator for a State of California Department of Social Services five-year study of welfare reform in California. She also is working on an National Institute of Health/National Institute on Aging four-year panel study of the Mexican American elderly entitled, "Health Care Use and Social Support." She served as the keynote speaker at a symposium on the urban elderly sponsored by the 1995 White House Conference on Aging.

Evelyn Blumenberg is an Assistant Professor of Urban Planning in the School of Public Policy and Social Research at the University of California, Los Angeles. She has a bachelor's degree in political science from the University of California, Berkeley, and a master's degree and Ph.D. in urban planning from the University of California, Los Angeles. Professor Blumenberg has extensive experience working with administrative and survey data to examine issues related to welfare, low-wage labor markets, and women's economic status.

Joseph Coughlin is Director of the New England University Transportation Center at the Center for Transportation Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His publications have focused on a variety of topics relating to transportation policy, particularly those related to transportation and the elderly, and the role of metropolitan planning organizations in responding to problems related to congestion and air quality. He received his Ph.D. in political science from Boston University.

Ginger Gherardi is the Executive Director of the Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC). Using CMAQ funds, VCTC created a new Countywide bus system, VISTA, linking municipal systems throughout the County that was recently given a 1997 Environmental Enhancement Award for Air Quality from FHWA. VCTC is currently participating in a federal "Smart Card" demonstration project and has implemented a website "Go Ventura" (<http://www.goventura.org>) that not only contains needed transportation information but provides personalized On-Line Transit Routing, first in the United States. Between September 1985 and July 1989 Ginger was the Manager of the Highway/TSM Programs for the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission.

Genevieve Giuliano is Professor and Acting Dean in the School of Urban Planning and Development at the University of Southern California. She received her Ph.D. in

Social Sciences from University of California, Irvine. Professor Giuliano's research interests include: relationships between land use and transportation, transportation policy evaluation, and impacts of information technology on transportation and travel behavior. Recent projects include impacts of changes in the organization of work on travel and location patterns; evaluation of new technology in public transit; and the determinants of growth of employment subcenters. Professor Giuliano is faculty fellow of the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, and a member of the Editorial Boards of *Urban Studies*, *Transportation Research*, and *Journal of Transport Statistics*. She has served on National Research Council committee projects, and is a member of several expert advisory panels.

Julia Henly received her Ph.D. in Social Work and Social Psychology from the University of Michigan in 1994. Before accepting her current faculty position at the University of Chicago's School of Social Service Administration she was an Assistant Professor at the UCLA School of Public Policy and Social Research in the Department of Social Welfare (1995-1997). Professor Henly's research is in the general areas of poverty, welfare policy, and the low-wage labor market. She has a particular interest in the informal coping strategies and support networks of low-income groups, and the effectiveness of these strategies under different social-contextual constraints. She has carried out research on the coping strategies and economic and psychological well-being of welfare recipients terminated from General Assistance, on the relevance of neighborhood characteristics for adolescent development, on the support networks of AFDC teenaged mothers, and on the barriers faced by low-income mothers in their search to find and maintain employment.

Mark Alan Hughes is Vice President for Policy Development at Public/Private Ventures in Philadelphia. In 1986, he joined the faculty of Princeton University and has been a visiting professor at Harvard, Swarthmore, and the University of Pennsylvania. Hughes has consulted on urban poverty to The Ford Foundation, the Urban Institute, the Brookings Institution, and the Lincoln Institute for Land Policy. He has written extensively on poverty issues, publishing in the academic journals of several disciplines. His research helped generate the four-year \$20 million national demonstration of job access strategies known as Bridges to Work, which is being conducted by public/Private Ventures in five metropolitan areas and sponsored by H.U.D. and the Ford, MacArthur, and Rockefeller Foundations.

Paul Leonard is currently serving as Acting Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research. In this capacity, he serves as principal advisor to the Secretary on all Departmental matters of policy, budget and legislation. He is responsible for the oversight of a \$34 million research budget covering housing finance, housing program, urban economic development, and welfare reform. He was

the principal author of *The State of the Cities* report released by the President in June 1997. Mr. Leonard serves as the Department's policy and budget analyst. He has coordinated development of comprehensive legislative proposals to reform public housing, consolidate tenant-based rental assistance programs, and restructure multifamily federally subsidized and insured housing portfolio. He is also responsible for providing policy analysis in support of Congressional consideration of HUD legislative, budget and appropriations proposals. Mr. Leonard serves as the point person for the Department's response to welfare reform.

Barbara J. Nelson was named the first permanent dean of the UCLA School of Public Policy and Social Research on November 1, 1996. Prior to her appointment as dean and professor of policy studies, she was vice president and distinguished professor of public policy at Radcliffe College where her portfolio included academic programs and strategic planning. Dr. Nelson's fields of expertise include social and economic policies in industrialized nations, organizational theory and behavior, and social movements. She is the author of four books and more than 50 articles and book chapters. She was a founding member of the Minnesota Supreme Court's Task Force on Gender Equity in the Courts, has consulted with the Swedish government on its Parliamentary Commission on Power and Democracy, and has worked with several United Nations agencies on questions of economic development and political participation. Nelson is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Center for the New West, and a former board member of Radcliffe College, the National Council for Research on Women, and the American Political Science Association.

Debbie Niemeier is a member of the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at the University of California, Davis. Her current research interests include conducting basic research examining how travel patterns differ among travel market segments and how these differences may affect our understanding of accessibility (and the types of transportation projects selected for funding). She is also developing new project prioritization and selection theory and methods that are more flexible and can incorporate a greater range of input criteria than those typically used. She is also conducting research on the interface issues between travel demands models (and thus the projects we select for building) and the air quality models.

Paul M. Ong is Professor of Social Welfare and Urban Planning, Chair of Department of Urban Planning in UCLA's School of Public Policy and Social Research, and Director for the joint LEAP (Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics) and UCLA Asian Pacific American Public Policy Institute. His professional experience includes working as a transportation economists for DeLeuw, Cather & Company, and a community planner and computer modeler for the Federal Highways Administration.

He has served on advisory committees for the Roy Wilkens Forum, California's Employment Development Department and Department of Social Services and for the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Professor Ong has done research on the labor market status of minorities and immigrants, displaced workers, and work and welfare. He is currently directing a study on the effects of affirmative action on employment and business opportunities in California, and a study of Southeast Asians on welfare.

John Quigley is Chancellor's Professor of Economics and Public Policy at the University of California, Berkeley. He also serves as Research Associate at Berkeley's Center for Real Estate and Urban Economics. His current research is on the integration of real estate, mortgage and financial markets, urban labor markets, housing and local public finance. He is the author of eight books and more than eighty scientific publications. He serves as a consultant to numerous private firms, to a variety of US government agencies, to international organizations, and to several foreign governments. He is the editor of *RSUE* and serves on the editorial board of ten other scholarly journals. He has served as Vice President of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management and as councilor of the Regional Science Association. He is a member of the TRED Committee of the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy and is a Fellow of the Homer Hoyt Institute. He recently served as President of the American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association and is currently President of the Western Regional Science Association.

Michael J. Rich is associate professor of political science at Emory University. He is the author of *Federal Policymaking and the Poor*, which was published by Princeton University Press in 1993, and several publications on federalism and a variety of urban policy topics, including community development, housing and homelessness, crime, and economic development. His current research focuses on community building, neighborhood revitalization strategies, and welfare reform, particularly concerning issues relating to the accessibility of low-income households to job opportunities. Prior to joining the faculty at Emory, Dr. Rich was an assistant professor of political science and public policy at Brown University where he also served as director of the Policy Analysis Laboratory at the Taubman Center for Public Policy and American Institutions. Dr. Rich received his Ph.D. in political science from Northwestern University and has held research appointments at the Brookings Institution and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Werner Schink serves as Chief of the Research and Evaluation Branch for the California Department of Social Services. The Research and Evaluation Branch is responsible for ensuring there are scientifically valid evaluations of California's major welfare reform initiatives. This includes major evaluations of the new statewide

CalWORKs Program, California Work Opportunities and Responsibility to Kids and the teen parent stay-in-school program CalLearn. Additionally, the organization has responsibility for evaluating 13 demonstration projects covering such areas as welfare-to-work for the very hard to serve, child support assurance, employment and training for non-custodial parents, child abuse and family violence reduction, and family preservation.

Donald Shoup has a background in both economics and engineering. His research focuses on transportation and public finance, in each case with an emphasis on links to the land market. Dr. Shoup has studied the issue of parking as a key link between transportation and land use. As a consultant to the U.S. Department of Transportation, he completed a report on "Cashing Out Employer-Paid Parking," which explains how employer-paid parking increases solo driving to work. As a remedy, he proposed that employers who subsidize employee parking should be required to offer employees the option to take the cash value of the parking subsidy if they do not take the parking itself. This proposal has since been passed into law in California, and the Clinton Administration has adopted the proposal as one of the legislative goals of its Climate Change Action Plan. Dr. Shoup is currently working on a grant from the California Air Resources Board to evaluate how cashing out employer-paid parking encourages ridesharing to work.

As a consultant to the World Bank, Dr. Shoup has worked on ways to finance public infrastructure in low-income neighborhoods. For example, his proposal for a new way to use special assessments to finance public services that benefit specific properties led to passage of California's deferred assessment legislation, which enables cities to use deferred special assessments to meet the public infrastructure needs of older neighborhoods.

Brian Taylor is an Assistant Professor of Urban Planning in the School of Public Policy and Social Research at UCLA, where he teaches courses in transportation policy and planning and urban public policy. His current research is on the politics of transportation finance and planning, including the history of freeway finance and the linking of subsidies to public transit performance. Professor Taylor has also examined the relationships between transportation and urban form, including the effects of suburbanization on employment access and the evolving commuting patterns of women, minority, disabled, and low-income workers. Most recently, he has studied the social equity aspects of various public transit subsidy programs.

Martin Wachs is Director of the University of California Transportation Center at the University of California, Berkeley, where he is also holds faculty appointments as

Professor of City and Regional Planning and of Civil and Environmental Engineering. Until July, 1996, he was Professor of Urban Planning and Director of the Institute of Transportation Studies at UCLA, where he had been a member of the faculty since 1971, and where he served three terms as Head of the Urban Planning Program. Dr. Wachs is the author or editor of four books and has written over one hundred published articles on transportation planning and policy, including the transportation needs of elderly and handicapped people; fare and subsidy policies in urban transportation, the problem of crime in public transit systems, and methods for the evaluation of alternative transportation projects. He has also done historical studies of the relationship between transportation investments and urban form in the early part of the twentieth century, and on ethics in planning and forecasting. Recently, his writings have dealt with the relationship between transportation, air quality and land use, and transportation finance.

Michael Wiseman is Professor of Public Affairs, Urban and Regional Planning, and Economics at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Senior Fellow at the Urban Institute in Washington, D.C. He is one of the country's longest-term welfare dependents, having begun work in the field of poverty and poverty policy as a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin in the late 1960's. Despite the efforts of various organizations to place time limits on his dependence, it continues. Professor Wiseman is involved in planning and evaluation of welfare reform initiatives in various states and in Europe. In 1996 he was appointed by Governor Tommy Thompson to be vice chairman and ranking external member of the Wisconsin Works Management and Evaluation Project, the state's umbrella organization for research on the design, implementation, and effects of Wisconsin welfare reforms. In California Professor Wiseman serves on the Department of Social Services Data Advisory Committee, and in Washington he is a member of the U.S. General Accounting Office's Welfare Reform Review Advisory Committee. His other fields of interest are policy analysis, public management, public economics, and urban economics.

PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

AC Transit
Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District
Applied Management & Planning Group
Article Foundation
California Department of Social Services
California State Legislature, Senate
Caltrans
Caltrans, Dept. of Transportation, New Technology Program
CalWORKs, Imperial County DSS
Chicago Transit Authority
Children's Defense Fund
Chrysalis Labor Connection
City and County of San Francisco Department of Human Services
Community Transportation Association of America
Contra Costa County Social Service Department
County of Alameda
County of Fresno, Department of Social Services
Crain & Associates
Department of Economics, University of California, San Diego
Department of City and Regional Planning, UC Berkeley
Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Cal Poly Pomona
Economic Roundtable
Federal Transit Administration
Foothill Transit
Health & Human Services Agency, County of San Diego
Human Services Dept./Employment & Training Division
Human Services Network
Job Express
LACTMA
LAIDLAW Transit Services
Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services
Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Milken Institute
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
North Richmond Employment Collaborative
Office of Strategic Planning & Government Relation, DPSS
Office of Supervisor Gloria Molina

Portland State University
Public Policy Institute of California
Refugee Program Bureau
Riverside County, Department of Public Social Services
Sacramento County Department of Human Assistance
San Bernardino County Department of Public Social Services
San Bernardino County Jobs & Employment Services Dept.
San Diego Association of Governments
San Francisco Department of Human Services
San Luis Obispo County Department of Social Services
School of Public Policy and Social Research, University of California, Los Angeles,
School of Social Ecology, University of California, Irvine
Senate Committee on Health and Human Services
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)
State Department of Social Services
Surface Transportation Policy Project
The California Endowment
The Urban Institute
U.S. Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
U.S. General Accounting Office
University of California, Davis
University of California, Irvine
University of California, San Diego
United Way of Greater Tucson
University of Michigan
Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute
Weingart Institute
Welfare Information Network

